REMARKS

Claims 1, 19, 22, 23, and 26-28 have been amended. Claims 30-44 were previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-29 are currently pending in this application. Of those claims, claims 26-29 were previously withdrawn. The status of the application in light of the Office Action mailed January 18, 2007, is as follows:

(A) Claims 1-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,420,975 ("Deline");

(B) Claims 1, 15, 19-21, and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,106,876 ("Santiago"); and

(C) Claims 22 and 23 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form

As a preliminary matter the undersigned wishes to thank Patent Examiner Addison for participating in an Examiner Interview on April 12, 2007. During the interview, the Deline and Santiago references were discussed. The parties tentatively agreed that the language included in amended claims 1 and 19 appeared to overcome the cited references, pending an additional search and further consideration. This paper constitutes the applicant's summary of this interview. If the Examiner notes any deficiencies with regard to this summary, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Response to Section 102 Rejections

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by both Deline and Santiago. As described below, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn because Deline and Santiago do not disclose or suggest all of the features of this claim.

(1) Claim 1 is directed to an acoustical system that includes, *inter alia*, acoustical transducers carried by a substrate and positioned to form an array having at least two dimensions.

Amended claim 1 is directed toward an acoustical system that includes a substrate having a plurality of conductive paths. The substrate is operatively coupleable to an output device. A plurality of acoustical transducers are carried by the substrate and positioned to form an array having at least two dimensions. The acoustical transducers are configured to sense sound and to transmit input signals to the substrate. The substrate is configured to receive the input signals and to transmit at least one output signal to the output device.

(2) Deline discloses two microphones carried by a mirror assembly.

As highlighted in the above referenced office action, Deline discloses two microphones 455, 456 carried by a mirror assembly 416 (col. 47, line 54-col. 48, line 2; Figure 13). The mirror assembly 416 also carries a digital sound processor 470 on a printed circuit board 418 (col. 47, line 54-col. 48, line 2; Figure 13). In Deline, the two microphones are not carried by the printed circuit board 418 and do not form a two dimensional array. Accordingly, Deline does not teach or suggest acoustical transducers carried by a substrate and positioned to form an array having at least two dimensions, wherein the substrate has a plurality of conductive paths, as recited in claim 1.

(3) Santiago discloses a printed circuit board that contains two microphone cartridges.

As highlighted in the above referenced office action, Santiago discloses a printed circuit board 325 that contains dual microphone cartridges 340, 350 (col. 4, lines 14-32; col. 5, lines 4-8). The two microphones in Santiago do not form a two dimensional array. Accordingly, Santiago does not teach or suggest acoustical transducers positioned to form an array having at least two dimensions, as recited in claim 1.

(4) Deline and Santiago do not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1.

As outlined in the Allowable Subject Matter section of the above referenced Office Action, Deline and Santiago fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, acoustical transducers positioned to form an array having at least two dimensions, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-18 depend from claim 1. For at least this reason, and for the additional features of these claims, claims 2-18 are also patentable over Deline and Santiago. Independent claim 19 includes features generally similar to those of claim 1. For at least this reason, and for the additional features of this claim, claim 19 is also patentable over Deline and Santiago. Claims 20, 21, 24, and 25 depend from claim 19. For at least this reason, and for the additional features of these claims, claims 20, 21, 24, and 25 are also patentable over the cited references.

Claims 22 and 23 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 22 and 23 have been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, these claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 is generic to withdrawn claim 26 because, as indicated in claim 3, in selected embodiments the acoustical transducers can include microphones. Amended independent claim 26 also includes features generally similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 26 is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, the undersigned respectfully requests that claim 26 be rejoined and allowed. Claims 27-29 depend from claim 26. For at least this reason, and for the additional features of these claims, claims 27-29 are also patentable over Deline and Santiago. Accordingly, the undersigned respectfully requests that claim 27-29 be rejoined and allowed.

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicant accordingly requests reconsideration of the application and a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a

telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6477.

Dated: 5 April 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Tim R. Seeley
Registration No.: 53,575
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant